Tab E

Media

IP Event Lesson Plan

1. ***Topic:***
media

2. ***Suggested activities:***

A. Community and regional newspaper offices and printing plant (arrange to meet editor-in-chief or news editor to discuss freedom of the press; also can talk with union employees)

B. Ethnic publications (black, Jewish, polish, etc.)

C. Military newspaper (base publication)

D. Bookstores (mall, independent, off-beat)

E. News dealer (especially one that sells foreign or specialized newspapers)

F. Post office

G. Radio, TV & cable stations (mainstream, ethnic) (try to visit "talk radio" program since it's great example of democracy in action), voice of America

H. Student newspapers at high school, college, etc.

I. Trade newspapers, magazines, etc.

3. ***Student requirements:***

A. Attire (civilian clothes/uniform)
B. Event information sheet
C. Camera and film
D. Money for emergency phone call or souvenirs

4. ***Escort requirements:***

A. Advance ticket purchases if necessary

B. Event information sheets for each international student

C. Ensure necessary briefing information is available

D. Brief (pre & post) international students about event(s)

E. Ensure escort(s) are familiar with event objectives to guarantee all points are adequately covered

F. Confirm/arrange transportation requirements

G. Event evaluation sheets are completed by each student

H. Discuss event with point of contact at event location and ensure escort carries point of contact's name and phone number

I. Ensure point of contact at event location is provided with the objectives to be covered prior to arrival of students

5. ***Introduce student to following objective(s) (under the universal declaration of human rights):***

A. ***Article 12:*** no one shall be subjected to arbitrary interference with his privacy, family, home or correspondence, nor to attacks upon his honor and reputation. Everyone has the right to the protection of the law against such interference or attacks.

B. ***Article 19:*** everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers.

6. ***IP area(s) of emphasis:***

A. Internationally recognized human rights as outlined in the universal declaration of human rights.

B. U.S. free enterprise system and its role in a democratic society.

7. ***Other learning objective(s) or teaching point(s):***

A. Free press essential to participation in American life (e.g., facts brought out by press in watergate, president Kennedy's assassination that government reluctant to disclose).

B. Free press acts as watchdog to guard against potential abuses of government power or government suppressing embarrassing information.

C. Diversity of media ensures people of all races, creeds, and political persuasions can be heard (editorials, letters to the editor) and ensures diverse, pluralistic culture.

D. Censorship disfavored except with certain exceptions during wartime (e.g., warship's sailing schedule) or civil disturbances (speech inciting to riot immediately can be punished). Some censorship to protect children from being used or exposed to pornography. Lively controversies regarding violence on TV, use of women in violent pornography. Can restrict commercial speech like liquor ads and cigarette ads on TV. War

censorship (e.g., Persian gulf): balance public's right to know with military necessity).

E. Free flourishing and exchange of ideas based on premise airing all viewpoints will result in "good" driving out "bad" in marketplace of ideas, so generally, no prior restraint on "hateful" ideas (kkk, American nazis, black panthers).

IP Event Information Sheet

Media

Free press issues in the 1990s

The primary mission of a free press is to report the news and inform the public. Individual papers May differ in emphasis, but members of the press share a core belief that free and full reporting on topics of public concern is both a Constitutional right and an essential public service of newspapers.

The framers of the Constitution believed a free press is essential to a democratic government, and they expressly enjoined Congress to "make no law.abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press." With that freedom, the press fills a fundamental need of a self-governing people by creating a marketplace for ideas and information regarding government, its leaders and the social systems they create.

The role of the press is not always understood or appreciated by government officials, members of the bar and bench, the military or the public at large.

The press thinks of itself as a watchdog, and the role is well taken. In the United States, it is the people who possess absolute sovereignty, not the government. People, and the press on their behalf, thus enjoy the right to freely examine what their government is doing, in all its manifestations.

James Madison asserted it some 200 years ago: the press has a right to freely examine public officials and public acts and to freely communicate its findings and opinions. He said this was the "only effective guardian of every other right." Justice Louis brandeis wrote in 1927 that "those who won our independence believed that freedom to think as you will and to speak as you think are means indispensable to the discovery of political truth;.that the greatest menace to freedom is an inert people; that public discussion is a political duty."

Accordingly, the press takes a critical and skeptical role in reporting on matters of public concern. No apology is required for vigorous reporting. The presumption is that informed citizens are best able to support or oppose public programs or policies. A free press May sometimes be an annoyance, but a tamed press hurts democracy.

In the clamor of the media marketplace, newspapers remain indispensable for an informed citizenry. It is print that endures, explores in depth and effectively stimulates public debate and voter response.

Freedom of the press carries heavy responsibilities. The press has to want that freedom enough to work for it, espousing the free-speech rights even of those who would subdue the press. The press should demonstrate that it is a fair and honest instrument for stimulating public debate on

the full range of issues that engage society. It must recognize public suspicions that it is exploitive, arrogant and insensitive.

Some of the press' rights and responsibilities are well defined.

— *non-interference by government.* The government can't tell the press what it should or shouldn't publish. The press and government are separate entities. Obviously, the press is mindful of national security concerns and freely acknowledges that, in some instances, government has the right to keep secrets. But the press has the right to publish information the government fails to keep secret. This is a political, not legal, tension.

— no *prior restraint.* Editors, not judges or government officials, should decide what is newsworthy. Though editors May abuse this privilege, society should tolerate this risk to preserve the free flow of information. The press needs the right to be wrong -- and has an obligation to accept responsibility for its errors.

— *honest, fearless reporting.* The press obviously should not falsify information or print news with serious doubts as to its truth. At the same time, the press has a right to reveal truthful facts about a newsworthy person without threat of suits for invasion of privacy.

— *unpopular reporting.* The press has a right to report without intimidation. It has the right to express

Unpopular, even abhorrent ideas. It has an obligation to seek out the voices of dissent. For every view offended, another May be encouraged.

— *confidential sources.* The press believes that it must from time to time rely on informants in government or knowledgeable private citizens who will speak only if promised confidentiality. The press is not at investigative arm of the government. The public interest is best served when press notes and sources remain confidential. This encourages the free flow of information.

In reporting on the legal system, the press seeks a free hand.

— *open proceedings.* A speedy and public trial by an impartial jury as guaranteed by the sixth Amendment can be assured only as long as there is a free press. The press should not be subjected to restrictions that impede that responsibility.

— *no judicial restraint.* The press has the right to gather, print and disseminate information. Any judicial restraint constitutes a prior government restriction against publication. Judges should not forbid legal officials from providing information that would inform the public, although exceptions, such as those regarding juveniles maybe be asserted.

— *pretrial reporting.* The press believes that pretrial reporting serves the public interest and, by and large, has not upset trials. In rare cases,

where pretrial publicity is deemed harmful, various safeguards are available to defendants, such as change of venue.

— *presumption of innocence.* As a public watchdog, the press fills a role of assuring that the accused is properly treated and fairly tried.

Unfettered access to military affairs best serves the public interest.

— *independent reporting.* Independent reporting should be the principal means of covering U.S. military operations. Pools should be limited to otherwise inaccessible locations or to the first hours of a U.S. military operation.

— *no censorship.* No one disputes the need for credentials in a combat zone and for clear, self-enforced military-security guidelines to protect U.S. forces and their operations. Military public affairs officers should act only as liaisons between the press and the military and should not interfere with reporting. News material should not be subject to censorship or review for military security. Violations of security could result in a suspension of individual credentials and expulsion from the area.

— *ease of filing.* Reporters should be provided access to all major military units. Transmission facilities should be made available for pools on a timely basis and for independent coverage when possible. Journalists should be allowed to file by whatever means are available.

— *an independent role.* The press is not part of the public relations effort supporting a particular military operation. It is far more valuable to the public as an independent source of information.

The following principles have been adopted by representatives of American news media and the pentagon to govern future arrangements for news coverage from the battlefield of the United States military in combat:

1. Open and independent reporting will be the principal means of coverage of U.S. military operations.

2. Pools are not to serve as the standard means of covering U.S. military operations. But pools May sometimes provide the only feasible means of early access to a military operation. Pools should be as large as possible and disbanded at the earliest opportunity -- within 24 to 36 hours when possible. The arrival of early-access pools will not cancel the principle of independent coverage for journalists already in the area.

3. Even under conditions of open coverage, pools May be appropriate for specific events, such as those at extremely remote locations or where space is limited.

4. Journalists in a combat zone will be credentialed by the U.S. military and will be required to abide by a clear set of military security ground rules that protect U.S. forces and their operations. Violation on the ground rules can result in suspension of the credentials and expulsion from the combat zone of the journalist involved. News organizations will make their best efforts to assign

experienced journalists to combat operations and to make them familiar with U.S. military operations.

5. Journalists will be provided access to all major military units. Special operations restrictions May limit access in some cases.

6. Military public affairs officers should act as liaisons, but should not interfere with the reporting process.

7. Under conditions of open coverage, field commanders will permit journalists to ride on military vehicles and aircraft whenever feasible. The military will be responsible for the transportation of pools.

8. Consistent with its capabilities, the military will supply paos with facilities to enable timely, secure, compatible transmission of pool material and will make these facilities available whenever possible for filing independent coverage. In cases when government facilities are unavailable, journalists will, as always, file by any other means available. The military will not ban communications systems operated by news organizations, but electromagnetic operational security in battlefield situations May require limited restrictions on the use of such systems.

9. These principles will apply as well to the operations of the standing dod national media pool system.

Note: The news media originally proposed 10 principles. One dealt with security review and said: "news material -- words and pictures -- will not be subject to security review." The pentagon proposed instead a principle that said: "military operational security May require review of news material for conformance to reporting ground rules." This fundamental disagreement could not be bridged, and representatives of the press and the military issued their separate views on this matter, as follows:

News media statement: the news organizations are convinced that journalists covering U.S. forces in combat must be mindful at all times of operational security and the safety of American lives. News organizations strongly believe that journalists will abide by clear operational security ground rules. Prior security review is unwarranted and unnecessary.

We believe that the record in operation desert storm, Vietnam and other wars supports the conclusion that journalists in the battlefield can be trusted to act responsibly.

We will challenge prior security review in the event that the pentagon attempts to impose it in some future military operation.

Department of defense statement: the military believes that it must retain the option to review news material, to avoid the inadvertent inclusion in news reports of information that could endanger troop safety or the success of a mission.

Any review system would be imposed only when operational security is a consideration -- for example, the very early stages of a contingency operation or sensitive periods in combat. If security review were imposed, it would be used for one very limited purpose: to prevent disclosure of information which, if published, would jeopardize troop safety or the success of a military operation. Such a review system would not be used to seek alterations in any other aspect of content or to delay timely transmission of news material.

Security review would be performed by the military in the field, giving the commander's representative the opportunity to address potential ground rule violations. The reporter would either change the story to meet ground rule concerns and file it, or file it and flag for the editor whatever passages were in dispute. The editor would then call the pentagon to give the military one last chance to talk about potential ground rule violations.

The defense department believes that the advantage of this system is that the news organization would retain control of the material throughout the review and filing process. The pentagon would have two chances to address potential operational security violations, but the news organization would make the final decision about whether to publish the disputed information. Under principle four, violations of the ground rules could result in expulsion of the journalist involved from the combat zone.

A Brief Profile of The American Press

The communications industry is the largest private-sector employer in the United States, and the news media make up the largest segment of that industry. Generating information, not just delivering it, is a growth business in the United States.

The American news business used to be a largely domestic enterprise, but no longer. Satellite delivery of 24-hour CNN broadcasts and same-day publication of the wall street journal in Asia and Europe are symptomatic of the U.S. media's new global reach.

Change has occurred in other aspects of the industry besides mere growth. American journalism itself has undergone a fundamental transformation in recent years, partly as a result of new technology and partly as a result of the changes in the society it has chosen to mirror. This is not surprising, since change itself is a hallmark of American culture. Whether it chooses to call itself an observer or not, the American news industry is a full-fledged participant in that culture, as well as in its country's democratic political system and its free-market economy.

Protected from government interference by a brief, 200-year-old clause in the American Constitution, the press has emerged as the self-appointed monitor of official life, recorder of public events and even the unofficial arbiter of public behavior. The U.S. news industry is also a very big business. Daily newspapers alone generate some $32 billion in advertising revenue a year. Magazines -- and there are more than 11,000 of them -- circulate more copies than there are Americans to read them. Every household has at least three radios, and more than 95 percent own televisions.

Needless to say, the press was not always such a mass medium. The American press started in the 18th century as a small instrument of the literate elite, and an unapologetic participant in partisan politics. It was a pamphleteering press, operated by colonial postmasters and opinionated printers. It was not for at least another century that the American press had transformed itself into a fairly non-ideological communications instrument, in step with the desires, dynamism and diversity of the country itself.

The American press has maintained two fundamental constants over the past two centuries:

(1) its independence from government, and
(2) its reliance on public acceptance -- if not approval -- for its financial survival.

Today, the press is better known as the media -- the plural for "medium" (or means of conveyance) and a reflection of its many components in the electronic age. For it is no longer the written word, but sight and sound that dominate the communications industry.

Some recent studies claim that 65 percent of Americans depend on television for their daily diet of news. Nevertheless, that statistic can be misleading, because it assumes that television fully satisfies the public's appetite for news. Within that same 65 percent there are many who read newspapers and magazines, listen to the radio, and receive a vast array of newsletters and brochures (much of it unsolicited advertising in their mailboxes). Now, they must deal with the newest member of the communications family: the fax. Add the VCR, computerized mail and something called interactive video, and it is no wonder Americans complain about "no time in the day" to do all the things they want or need to do. They spend so much time communicating!

One of the consequences of these choices is increase competition in the information and advertising marketplace for a person's attention, and this scramble has helped blur the once-clear line between information, entertainment and commerce. Journalism is no longer quite so easy to define as it was just a decade ago. The American news business is currently facing what the psychiatric profession calls an "identity crisis." This is particularly true in the newspaper industry, which is watching its role (and its revenue) shrink in the electronic age. Connected with this is the concern, as well as some evidence, that America's reading habit is diminishing, largely as a result of television and home video.

It is highly premature to sound a funeral dirge for the print media. Nearly every American town of any size (10,000 population or more) still has its own newspaper and access to a metropolitan daily as well.

The story of the American press is a complex one, reflecting the pluralism of the country itself. A favored description is diversity. Nevertheless, there are some common threads that bind the media in the United States. Here are some of the most important of its common traits:

— the American news industry is a business
— the industry views itself as a public trust
— the news industry is largely unregulated
— there is no uniform definition of news
— the mainstream press is generally non-ideological
— America's press tradition is community based

The American press and broadcast industries are mostly profit-seeking enterprises, and must be financially healthy in order to survive. Only a small percentage are subsidized (less than 20 percent of the broadcast industry, less than one percent of the print media). Most depend upon commercial advertising for the bulk of their income -- about 75 percent. In 1991, the media overall earned $130 billion in advertising revenue.

A newspaper owner/publisher is often more a businessman than a journalist, while the editor is usually the keeper of the paper's news mission. The publisher, who has the ultimate say in what the product looks like, May not want to carry news that will hurt his business, while the editor in the American system is usually ruled by the dictum: "if it's news, publish it." In the best of the business, the publisher gives the editor ultimate authority over the news.

One of the ways in which the information side of the industry guards itself against the profit-motive conflicts is to clearly separate the business department from the news department ("church" and "state," as some have called the relationship), insulating each from the influence of the other. In recent years, however, this traditional insulation has broken down to some degree as newspapers, news magazines and broadcast news programs have stepped up the fight to gain more "market share."

With so many media outlets and new opportunities for advertisers to reach consumers in other ways, media competition for the advertising dollar is fierce. Critics say this heavily contributes to a policy of pandering to an audience's desires and prurient tastes, rather than to the audience's needs. Proponents of the system say, on the other hand, that attention to one's marketplace is the most effective way of serving the public, and that the role of the press is not to dictate or lecture to its audience.

At the heart of this new devotion to "customer service" is the advent of group ownership and the decline of inner-community newspaper competition. The result is a more homogenous industry. Most "family owned" newspapers and local broadcast stations have been purchased by large media conglomerates, and this has adversely affected individuality -- a trend in non-media industries as well.

The overwhelming criterion for success in America's group-owned media is profitability. This, coupled with the fear that Americans are spending less time reading the news, has radically changed the look of the American paper. Following a format started by the Gannett-owned USA today, most newspapers have introduced more color, eye-catching graphics, shorter stories and more entertainment news to appeal to the television generation.

This is not to suggest that group ownership and a growing preoccupation with profitability are intrinsically harmful to journalism. As ironic as it May seem, some of the most profitable news organizations are also the best ones, because they have used their expanding income to finance better quality coverage.

As with other wide open press systems, the recurrent accusation that the mass media engage in sensationalism in order "to sell newspapers" is a difficult charge to refute. But, it is important to note that the American working journalist is not concerned about the employer's profits; getting on the front page, yes, but selling newspapers, no. What appears in the news columns of today's papers is still largely the purview of working journalist, not businessmen.

Treating itself as both a business and a public trust can cause conflict, if not confusion, within the news industry itself, not to mention in the eyes of the public.

Nevertheless, the "public's right to know" remains at the core of America's free-press philosophy, and guides the way it conducts itself, particularly in relations with government. Some call this relationship "adversarial." Others prefer to think of it more benignly as simply a monitoring role, without the inference of opposition.

It is a relationship in which officials try to tell their version of events or avoid publicity altogether, while the press looks for mistakes and fights attempts to suppress information. Largely in response to pressure from the media, a number of state legislatures have passed "sunshine" laws that require government meetings to be held in public. There is also a federal freedom of information (foi) act, which gives requesting citizens -- usually journalists -- access to government records and documents not classified for security reasons.

In short, the American press enjoys its role as the "watchdog of government." The power that comes from this largely self-appointed role has earned the press the honorific title, "the fourth

estate," after the three official branches of government (legislative, judicial and executive). It is also this role that prompted Thomas Jefferson, one of the founders of American democracy, to say some 200 years ago: "if i had a choice between government without newspapers or newspapers without government, i should not hesitate for a moment to choose the latter."

It was this vision of how a democracy should work that prompted the framers of the U.S. Constitution to make free expression the first Amendment of this charter's "Bill of Rights." In reality, the Amendment simply said that Congress cannot enact a law infringing free speech or a free press. That brief clause has been the beacon and the shield for the American press for over two centuries, but it is not carved in stone for eternity. It is tested almost daily in the courts, on the streets and in the corridors of power. So far, this first Amendment protection has withstood these tests.

As part of this protection, the American news media enjoy a certain immunity from official reprisal. It is extremely difficult, for example, for a public official to win a libel suit against the media, because the courts have ruled that government servants must be open to special scrutiny and accountability in a democratic system. American journalists have also won a number of battles to protect the anonymity of news sources from government inquiry, but that war periodically erupts.

One area of continuing uncertainty is that of national security and government secrecy. Historically, American journalists have enjoyed more latitude in this arena than, for example, the British press. Periodically, the federal government warns journalists they can be prosecuted under existing law for compromising American intelligence-gathering efforts. But, this has not been seriously enforced or pursued in recent years.

The American media is far more vulnerable to legal action from private citizens, whose right to privacy can be in direct confrontation with what the press calls the public's "right to know." Libel is a civil, rather than a criminal offense in the United States, but the enormous size of monetary awards and penalties levied by the courts in recent years has had a "chilling" effect on journalistic enterprise, according to many in the news industry.

The increase in libel suits is just one example of what the American press perceives as diminishing support from the public. A 1991 survey by the American society of news editors indicated that more than a quarter of the public polled would not support any protection for the press if the Constitution were voted on today, and less than half would give it some protection. This is a reflection of such negative opinions of the media as arrogant, biased, inaccurate and intrusive.

Credibility surveys vary on the question of who the American people trust more -- their press or their government. The answer varies with time and circumstance. Following the watergate scandal in the early 1970s, the press enjoyed a high degree of public confidence. But, following scandal coverage that led to a senator's withdrawal from the 1988 presidential race, the press came under sharp criticism on charges of exceeding the bounds of good taste and privacy.

In general, the American press believes that too many citizens confuse media self-interest with the public interest. While journalists worry about these perceptions, they tend to see them more as a public relations challenge than a mandate for significant change.

A serious publication like the new York times and a fictional tabloid sold in supermarkets, both call themselves newspapers. There is no law, no government agency and no person to say otherwise, because there is no licensing requirement for newspapers to operate and no enforceable definition of what constitutes a legitimate news publication.

In addition, the American news industry and journalistic profession do not regulate themselves in the same sense as the legal or medical professions. The press does not require minimum standards for membership, does not issue or revoke licenses and does not regulate professional standards. Each news organization and journalistic association adheres to its own codes and standards.

The decision as to whether one is eligible and qualified to be a journalist in America is also solely up to the employer. However, more and more American journalists are graduates of journalism schools, a trend which helps standardize minimum qualifications throughout the country.

Despite the individualism and diversity, there is a remarkable similarity of values and practices in the mainstream news industry. These values stress the importance of public service, impartial reporting, and balance of opinion. Most American newspapers also take pains to separate information from opinion, by clearly differentiating the news columns from the editorial section.

Although there is no official regulation of the press, there are unofficial "checks and balances" against journalistic excess, both outside and inside the industry. The external checks include libel laws and self-appointed press monitors. Competition also tends to help keep news organizations "honest." The internal checks include the appointment by some newspapers of an "ombudsman" to investigate public complaints, publish self-criticism and enforce internal standards.

Different from the print media, the broadcast media in the United States require a government (federal) license to operate, because the space-limited airwaves are regarded as public property. There are, however, safeguards against political discrimination in the licensing process, and there have been remarkably few examples of ideological or political bias in issuing or revoking licenses. Government decisions on broadcast licensing are primarily aimed at ensuring competition and diversity.

There is no universally accepted definition or set of definitions for "news" in the American media. This is because there is no single role designated for the press. Among the roles the American press has chosen for itself are to inform, to educate, to reform, to entertain, to incite or all of the above.

Within a broad range of definitions there is general agreement as to what is news-worthy and what is not. The most prevalent characteristics include: the activity of officials and celebrities, government action of any kind, events that are new or bizarre (i.e. crime and disaster), revelations that are titillating or shocking (i.e. sex and scandal) and new social trends.

Emphasis on the unusual is a mainstay of modern American journalism, explained by the adage: "if a dog bites man, it is not news; if a man bites dog, that’s news." The public tends to have a love-hate relationship with this definition. On one hand, the audience is entertained or provoked by the news; on the other hand, it is resentful that "normal life" tends to be ignored.

There was a time in America when few would argue with the cantankerous editor who declared: "news is what i say it is." With renewed attention to the desires of the buying public, such editors are hard to find today.

In an effort to be more useful and relevant to the buyer, one of the most successful innovations in recent years has been to enlist the press in the cause of consumer service investigating buyer complaints, exposing business fraud, and offering marketplace advice.

Perhaps the greatest source of pride in American journalism is the tradition of investigative reporting, largely aimed at exposing abuses of power. The Pulitzer prize, the most coveted award in American journalism, is given annually for superior investigation and public service. In recent

years, the business community has come under the kind of press scrutiny that was traditionally reserved for government, even though access to business information is usually harder to obtain.

During this century, the mainstream media in the United States have remained largely non-ideological. Very few mass-circulation papers, magazines or broadcast stations are affiliated with political organizations, parties, or movements. It was not always so, but purposeful non-affiliation has been a hallmark of the American press for more that a century. This characteristic -- both a source of professional pride and a result of economic self-sufficiency -- is one of the main features that distinguishes the American press from many others around the world.

Although most papers, and some stations, voice a political preference in their editorials, news reporting is generally non-partisan. Editorial opinion is often based on the merits of an issue, and it is not unusual for these opinions to stray outside a particular ideological framework.

Not everyone believes the American press is free of ideology. Conservative critics say the American news media -- particularly those based in new York and Washington -- reflect a "liberal bias." By that, they generally mean that the press is too quick to criticize authority and does not support America's interests.

Left-of-center critics, on the other hand, accuse the press of government cronyism and uncritical reporting about Washington's policies and practices. American journalists tend to feel most

Comfortable when attacked by both sides of the ideological spectrum. They believe it confirms their impartiality.

In fact, there is a pattern of political preference within the news industry, albeit undeclared. Studies have shown that American reporters tend to be more liberal than editors and program directors, who in turn tend to be more liberal than publishers and station owners. These leanings May rarely be visible to the public, but are part of the dynamic tension that pervades the American newsroom.

Traditionally, the U.S. government has stayed out of the news business. The only government-owned/controlled media in the United States are those that broadcast overseas, such as the voice of America and radio free Europe. By law, these stations are not allowed to broadcast within the borders of the United States, so most Americans have had only peripheral exposure to them.

There is partial government subsidy of public television and radio in the United States, but safeguards have built against political interference. As a matter of fact, public broadcasting news programs tend to be more anti-establishment than those of commercial broadcasting, and are thus perceived as being more critical of government.

The American press has always had a local, rather than a regional or national character. Although new technology has broadened this horizon considerably, the U.S. media still concentrate to a large degree on the needs and interests of viewers, listeners and readers in the immediate neighborhood. There are strong economic reasons for this, but it is also a reflection of American provincialism.

The history of the United States is streaked with isolationism, and the press has often reflected this inwardness. Actually, studies have shown that most of the world's press systems tend to

Be more provincial than international, with some exception in the press systems of northern Europe and east Asia.

One of the most common complaints of visitors to the United States is that there is so little international news, relative to America's strong presence around the world.

In fact, there is a great deal of international news reaching America, but only a small portion of it is carried by the community-focused mass media. And that portion carried in one community May not be carried in another, because of the different interests of the residents.

For example, in Chicago there is a large polish-American population, and consequently, the press there gives prominence to news of eastern Europe. Since new York has a large Jewish population, modest news is big there. Also, much of the international news reaching the states finds its way to specialized publications with limited circulation.

It is true that the American correspondent corps is based in fewer than one-half of the world's nations. Most of the approximately 700 foreign correspondents are clustered in the so-called major capitals: Tokyo, Beijing, London, Paris, Bonn, Moscow, Prague, Warsaw, Cairo, Tel Aviv, Nairobi, Johannesburg, Buenos Aires, Rio and Mexico city. Consequently, most foreign news is reported from and written under these datelines.

American correspondents are also frequent targets of criticism that they are not fully prepared in language or in background to cover a foreign country in depth. The days are gone when a reporter was snatched off the police beat to cover an event in some far-off land.

American correspondents are better prepared for their assignments than they were just 10 years ago, although their employers still tend to favor general professional competence over geographic specialization. One reason for this is the requirement of mobility. A reporter in Cairo, for example, has to be ready at a moment's notice to cover a major event anywhere in north Africa or the middle east, because the U.S. correspondent corps is stretched so thinly around the globe.

The size and scope of the overseas press corps is largely an economic issue. To keep one correspondent abroad costs an average of $250,000 a year.

As a general rule, the American press does a fairly thorough job of covering the "big story" overseas, tailored to an American audience. It gives little attention to the day-to-day news abroad, and does not cater to the foreign audience.

More than 90 percent of America's daily newspapers depend upon the news agencies (wire services), primarily the associated press, for news of the world outside their own regions. This is because only a handful of the largest newspapers have their own national and foreign staff. (they include *the New York Times, The Wall Street Journal, The Washington Post, the Chicago Tribune, the Los Angeles Times, the Baltimore Sun, the Boston Globe and the Christian Science Monitor.)* Most of these papers have established their own news services, giving newspapers more choices than they have had in the past. This profusion of select services is given as a prime reason that united press international (UPI) has lost so many customers in recent years.

Some critics of American news coverage abroad detect an inordinate amount of coverage priority given to countries high on Washington's official agenda. They stand on less firm ground when they argue that coverage and commentary mostly conform to U.S. foreign policy objectives. There are just too many examples to the contrary, stretching from central America back to Vietnam.

For better or worse, the American media will remain a strong force in public life. Modern society has become too dependent upon quick and reliable information for it to be otherwise. But, the shape of that future remains uncertain.

In just a handful of years, the American news business had already undergone tremendous changes as a result of a transformation in technology, market forces and public tastes. Too many new players have entered the information field for journalism to ever be the same as it was. The profession never really stood still for long anyway.

The daily newspaper industry, trying to catch up with the electronic media and other newcomers, seems to have suffered most in this recent transformation. But as long as the American press remains largely immune from government interference, there will always be new opportunities for the industry and new choices for the public.

Whatever happens, it will be the public that decides the future of the American news industry. That, free-press advocates say, is the beauty of the system.

The American Electronic Media

A Brief Outline of Broadcasting, Cable and Related Services in the United States

American broadcasting and other electronic media are organized quite differently than they are in many other countries. Most stations, cable systems, and networks are in business to earn a profit, usually by sale of advertising time. This information is designed to provide overseas visitors with an outline of how the U.S. electronic media system developed and how it works now.

Growing out of wireless experiments in Britain, the U.S., and elsewhere, the first experimental broadcast stations operated in the U.S. in the years prior to world war i. They had sporadic schedules of but a few hours a week. The first broadcast in the world was probably done by regional Fessenden on christmas eve 1906 from a transmitter south of Boston.

Am (or medium wave) radio broadcasting began on a regular basis in late 1920 when several stations first went on the air, primarily to sell radio receivers (the first stations were owned by GE, Westinghouse and RCA, all major electrical manufacturers). In 1922 the number of stations shot up from about 30 to more than 500 -- with no overall supervision or regulation about access to spectrum. The public craze for radio dates to this time. Only after much pressure from radio operators did Congress finally agree to set up a regulatory scheme to license stations in 1927.

Until 1941, broadcasting in this country consisted only of am stations and networks. In 1926-28, both the CBS and NBC networks began operation, rapidly establishing the pattern of advertising-supported entertainment programs that still characterizes the American system of electronic media.

Just before the U.S. entered world war ii (December 1941), fm (or vhf) radio and television broadcasting was approved for regular operation. Only a few stations of either service got on the air before a wartime freeze of most civilian construction which lasted until 1946.

From 1945-52, the industry and federal communications commission grappled with allocations problems for fm and television, and getting both services up and running. Fm was moved from its old allocation to the present 88-108 MHz in 1945.

Television networks owned by ABC, CBS, and NBC (and, for a time, dumont) began regular operation in the fall of 1948. Then, just as the public's appetite for television was at its height, the FCC had to suspend accepting applications for new television stations from September 1948 until April 1952 while crucial decisions were made to:

— add uhf frequencies (to the 12 vhf channels already in use) to allow more television stations in more communities, and to

— reserve some frequencies for noncommercial TV stations in a parallel proceeding, color television standards were issued late in 1953 (though color was not commercially important until the late 1960s).

The number of stations on the air slowly grew after 1952 as both television and am expanded. For much of that decade, fm radio stagnated due to lack of original programming, limited numbers of receivers, and almost total disinterest in the secondary radio service by advertisers because of tiny audiences. Only after 1958 did the number of fm stations begin to climb as interest in hi-fi sound aided its expansion, which was pushed further by agreement on fm stereo standards early in 1961, and requirements after the mid-1960s that most fm stations program differently than co-owned am operations. That gave the medium an identity of its own for the first

Time, and by 1979, more people listened to fm than am. A decade later, three quarters of all radio listening was to fm stations.

Competition for broadcasting was slow in developing. The first community antenna television (catv, now usually called cable) systems began operation in the rocky mountains and in the appalachians where small towns could not get signals from distant markets, and were too

Small to support stations on their own. Only a tiny proportion of Americans were "on cable" until well into the 1970s.

In 1975 came two separate developments that would show the way to a more competitive future in electronic media. Sony placed the first betamax VCRs on sale and home box office, a pay-cable service, announced plans to begin use of a domestic communications satellite (domsat) transponder to deliver its signal across the nation.

Fifteen years later, two-thirds of all American households had VCRs and could "time-shift" their viewing; about 60 percent had "basic" cable television service (that supported by advertising); about 30 percent subscribed to one or more pay cable networks, and virtually all national electronic media program services were distributed to stations and cable systems by means of domsats.

Cable program networks expanded rapidly after the late 1970s, with cable news network and others beginning operation by 1980. At the same time, the number of noncommercial and independent (of network affiliation) stations grew, giving viewers more choice of programming.

Where the networks dominated "prime time" viewing, controlling about 90 percent of those watching television in 1980, a decade later their share of the TV audience had dwindled to between 55-60 percent. The audience was making increasing use of competitive cable services, rental movies for their VCRs, and independent or noncommercial broadcast stations.

Broadcasting in America is based on a system of privately owned local radio and television stations and cable television systems. While these outlets are widely diversified in their ownership, nearly all subscribe (contract for) one or more national program services or networks.

In round numbers, there are nearly 12,000 broadcast stations in the country: more than 5,000 am, 5,000 fm and nearly 1,500 television stations. Major markets often have 30 or more radio stations and five to seven television stations.

Federal regulation allows any company or individual (who must be U.S. citizens) to control up to 12 am, 12 fm, and 12 television stations, no more than one of each kind in a given market. There are no ownership limits on the number of cable systems or subscribers one company can control. Telephone companies are not allowed to own cable systems where they also provide telephone service, a limitation presently under attack by the telephone industry. One owner cannot control a television station and cable service in the same marketplace.

Most television stations affiliate (sign a contract with) a national network in order to carry its programs. Fewer radio stations are network affiliates.

There are four television broadcast networks (ABC, CBS, NBC, and more recently, fox) which each own a few stations in large markets (called o&os for owned-and-operated), and are affiliated by contract with about 200 other stations across the country.

There is no ownership connection between the networks -- they are held independently of one another. Network programs are beamed to o&o and affiliate stations by means of satellites. The broadcast networks (except fox) each operate news divisions which present daily newscasts and specials. Entertainment programming is all leased from independent companies.

There are nearly 60 cable networks, all of which are distributed nationally by means of domestic satellite (domsat) transponders which beam signals to the "headends" of cable systems for distribution to homes. Of these networks, a few are pay networks (home box office, owned by time Warner, is the oldest and largest) where viewers subscribe by paying a monthly fee averaging nearly $10 to $50 a month. The rest are advertiser supported services such as turner broadcasting system, the discovery network, and the USA network.

Many cable networks are very specialized -- in comedy, weather forecasts, and business news. More services are announced all the time.

Dozens of radio networks -- most of them music services -- deliver programming by satellite or mailed recordings. A few provide regular news services, including two owned by westward one, NBC radio, and the mutual network.

Broadcasting and most cable services in America are supported by sale of advertising time. Of all advertising dollars spent each year, television takes about 22 percent and radio another 7 percent. Cable advertising is negligible thus far -- perhaps 1 percent of the total. For comparison, newspapers account for about 29 percent of all advertising dollars. The largest portion of broadcast advertising revenue comes from sales to local advertisers.

Most commercial television stations devote between 10 and 12 minutes per hour to advertising, usually less in prime time hours. Radio stations carry more advertising -- often 18 to 20 minutes per hour. Cable advertising is relatively undeveloped thus far.

The electronic media industries are not large. About 100,000 people work directly in radio or television broadcasting, mostly for local television stations. The typical radio station May have just two or three employees in small markets and up to several dozen in bigger cities. Increasing use of automation has cut the size of station staffs.

Television outlets have anywhere from 25 to several hundred employees. Cable systems have many employees in customer relations and repair but only a few are needed in technical operational and program categories.

Most of this overview deals with commercial broadcasting, as that is the most widely available and most listened to service. There is an alternative service in both radio and television.

The first noncommercial radio stations went on the air in the 1920s (and, experimentally, even earlier). Many were school systems and universities operated stations -- most had given up their licenses by the early 1930s under financial pressure, lack of sure need for the facilities, and demands for their frequencies from commercial operators. By the end of world war ii, there were only about 25 am (medium wave) educational stations on the air.

When the FCC approved fm (vhf) radio on its present spectrum in 1945, it set aside the lowest 20 channels for noncommercial operation (88-108 MHz). Beginning in the late 1940s, and growing steadily ever since, the noncommercial radio industry has now expanded to some 1,400 outlets by 1990.

Key to that expansion was a rising federal government funding role (prior to 1963, there was no federal funding for noncommercial radio -- the chief national supporter was grants from the ford foundation). Formation of the corporation for

Public broadcasting (cpb) in 1967, and its creation of national public radio (NPR) a year later gave the noncommercial stations their first nation-wide identity.

Noncommercial television stations lacked reserved channels until 1952; however, they received them only after several years of government debate over the idea. The first stations, mainly on the uhf band, went on the air in 1953-54. Early years saw slow growth of stations, usually for lack of finance. Well into the 1970s, many major cities and some whole states lacked even one noncommercial station.

As with radio, ford foundation funding was central to the survival of the pioneering noncommercial stations, most of which were run by universities or community organizations.

Creation of cpb in 1967, and its formation of the public broadcasting service (PBS) a year or so later, helped to give the scattered noncommercial television stations a national identity. Increased federal funding and those national programs pushed the number of noncommercial stations to well over 300 by 1990. Several states operate networks of public TV stations, enabling state-wide coverage or important events.

Until recently, about half of all money helping to support the noncommercial stations and networks came from taxes -- federal funds through the corporation for public broadcasts (cpb) set up by Congress in 1967, or state taxes in support of stations in that state. Tax support by 1990 amounted to under 40 percent of total revenues. The remainder comes from businesses providing program grants (called underwriting), individual donations, foundations, and other sources.

Public broadcasters argue that their chief problem is and always has been to raise sufficient money to operate. They note that public radio and television in the U.S. operates with a fraction of the revenue of commercial broadcasting. Some critics have suggested that the lack of a clear agreement on the role of a noncommercial service in the largely commercial American system is at the heart of the continuing quest for funds.

Cpb, and the two network operations, NPR for radio and PBS for television, largely represent noncommercial or "public" broadcasting in the Washington policy arena. Each of them suffers from the concern of local radio and television operators that the public system May get too centralized (as is perceived to be the case with the commercial system), and thus friction

between stations wanting local control, and the national bodies wanting more efficient nation-wide planning, continues.

NPR connects some 250 noncommercial radio stations -- the larger and better-financed outlets. It provides popular news programs such as *all things considered* in the early evening, and *morning edition* weekday mornings. NPR produces much of what it provides to stations.

On the other hand, PBS only operates the interconnection of the television network. (noncommercial television pioneered American use of satellite networking when it began full-time use of satellites rather than landlines in 1985. Noncommercial radio, and the commercial broadcast networks later followed suit.)

All PBS programs are produced by a few major public TV stations (such as those in Boston, new York, San Francisco, and Washington, dc), overseas broadcast systems (especially those in Britain), or independent producers. Through a complicated "station program

Cooperative" voting process each year, PBS member stations vote their support dollars for programs they want.

There is a continuing debate about the role of a noncommercial or public broadcast system within a largely commercial context. Proponents of public service broadcasting have argued for years that only noncommercial stations can offer the culture, education and other programs to balance the largely entertainment fare offered by the networks and cable.

Critics say that the number of channels received in most houses increases, and as VCR ownership surges past two-thirds of all American homes, that noncommercial broadcasting is too expensive to continue to support. Those who desire such programs can receive them less expensively by means of videotapes or other methods while the channels now held by noncommercial stations could be put to far more efficient use by others.

The development of children’s, science and other specialized cable networks has only added pressure on noncommercial broadcasters to justify why they should continue to enjoy reserved channels and other exemptions from rules that impact all other broadcasters.

As is true in other broadcasting systems, the chief and continuing problem for the electronic media is the appetite of stations and channels for program material. The process of developing and airing those programs is briefly outlined here.

The entertainment programming that occupies most network time (and makes up the majority of syndicated programming) is produced by independent companies, most based in the Hollywood area of southern California.

"Prime time" is the most important competitive showcase for television network programming, and is largely devoted to comedy and drama programs. Schedules are set late each spring to begin the new TV "season" in September. Unsuccessful programs (those with low ratings) are replaced through the year as needed.

Local network affiliates simply carry network programming in prime time and many daytime hours. Remaining time is nearly all filled with other entertainment programming (chiefly game shows and reruns of network material) offered to stations on a syndicated basis (the station buys the rights to air a program two or three times over a given period, usually exclusive rights for that city).

Virtually no entertainment programming is produced locally -- it is far too expensive. Further, little imported programming is shown on commercial stations.

The vast majority of radio programming in this country consists of various types of recorded popular music. In major cities, some stations emphasize news and talk formats, but most exist to play records and provide short newscasts -- and lots of advertisements! Radio networks were important until the 1950s, when television competition killed them off. In recent years, use of satellites to distribute radio program formats has revived some degree of national programming.

Some surveys suggest most Americans get most of their news (especially national and international) from television. With the rise of cable news network (CNN) and other cable information services, this May be even more true. Newspaper reading is in decline -- circulation is not keeping up with population growth. Many Americans get their view of the world from five-minute radio newscast, or bits and pieces on network or local station programs. News is popular with audiences and advertisers.

The evening network half-hour newscasts (with "anchors" Dan rather on CBS, tom Brokaw on NBC, and peter kennings on ABC) get most of the news viewership. In recent years, CNN's two news networks have become something of a viewing habit with many Americans, given their 24-hour availability in homes with cable TV.

Other serious information programming -- interviews, public affairs programs, documentaries -- are in decline in America. Fewer such programs are offered today because audiences are small, and advertisers are thus not very interested. Public television shows most documentaries, and many of those are produced abroad (chiefly in Britain)

The content of all these programs are largely determined by the networks (or local stations for their own local evening newscasts -- major attractions for advertisers and audiences). National news agencies provide considerable input, but most American networks have their own reporters, and use stringers in more remote areas. A common criticism from foreign visitors is that American broadcast news tends to ignore much of the rest of the world except in time of crisis.

Certainly the best-known American television program for children is *sesame street,* a product of the children's television workshop in new York, which first aired on public television in 1969. "big bird," "kermit the frog," and other "muppet" characters are known around the world in various national versions of this highly successful combination of live action, animation and lessons.

The other well-known children's program effort is, unfortunately, not as constructive. The television networks all reach children Saturday morning with a "kidvid ghetto" of action-adventure cartoons, some of them quite violent, and all pushing commercial products (food and games, chiefly). Many critics argue this programming is not pro-social for young children.

Professional and college football is the most popular continuing sports coverage on television. Radio and television also present hours of baseball and basketball coverage, with less time given over to other sports (soccer, for example, is but a minor sport in the U.S., unlike the rest of the world). The general public also gets very interested in olympics coverage. There is some evidence (falling audience ratings) that audiences May have reached the saturation point with some sports coverage.

Since about 1930, ever-better means of researching and reporting audience listening and viewing habits have had a major impact on program trends. A.C. Nielson (a division of dun & bradstreet) and arbitron (part of control data) are the major national ratings firms. Nielsen reports network and local market TV ratings, while arbitron reports local market television and radio ratings. There is no ownership connection between these companies and any other broadcasting entity.

Ratings are gathered because advertisers need to know who and how many are watching programs -- this information being crucial in deciding which media to "buy" for a given product. Broadcasters (and increasingly cable networks) "sell" audiences to advertisers, using ratings to measure their reach -- how many of the potential audience are in the actual audience.

Ratings are based on the principle of sampling. For example, Nielson draws its national ratings from a sample of about 4,000 homes, scientifically selected to represent various geographic regions of the country, along with different economic and social groups. These ratings are said to be a fair representation of national listening patterns, plus or minus about three percent.

Ratings are gathered by different methods. Most recent -- and controversial -- is use of the people meter, a device requiring viewers to punch in a remote control device when prompted by a computer in their receiver.

Older methods include telephone surveys of various kinds, and keeping paper diaries of listening or watching activity over a week or so.

Ratings are often criticized as being a main cause of programs being primarily entertainment -- and all looking much alike.

That media are politically important comes as no surprise to anybody. (note how often when a government is under siege that rebel forces seek out the radio or television stations to take their story directly to the people and the outside world.) In the U.S., electronic media play a vital role in the election campaigns for both local and especially national office. Television time is expensive and has for some time made up the largest portion of election campaign budgets.

It is now traditional (but certainly not required) for presidential candidates to debate one another on television a few times during the campaign. These "debates" are usually in the form of candidates answering questions rather than directly facing off against one another.

The media in the United States and elsewhere are also said to have an "agenda setting" effect on listeners. If the media cover a given event or problem area, then surveys show that most viewers think more readily of that issue -- that the deficit or hunger or some other problem is a serious one. On the other hand, many overseas visitors complain that Americans think too little about other countries because there is so little news of other countries evident in American media, except for crisis situations.

Long controversial, with research providing mixed results, is the question of violent content in television programs (and movies). Much research indicates that watching a diet of violence-filled drama will make viewers more likely to take violent action themselves in similar situations. Of special concern is the impact of years of cartoon and actual dramatic violence on children.

In America, the government cannot simply mandate changes in broadcast programs (whether for this or other reasons) because of the first Amendment to the Constitution, which protects media content from government interference. Thus, government officials and concerned citizens are reduced to asking the media to moderate program content, or develop self-regulatory codes to limit the impact of such material.

Two provisions of the American Constitution govern the regulation of communications. The "commerce clause" (Article 1, section 8) gives Congress the right to regulate commerce between and among the states and foreign countries. The first Amendment guarantees freedom of speech and the press. From these two precedents, both over 200 years old, comes all governmental activity in communication.

Congress first passed laws regulating wireless in 1910 and 1912. Only in 1927 was the first law passed specifically to regulate the licensing of broadcasting stations. That law created the all-important "public interest, convenience and necessity" (picon) standard by which licensing and other regulatory decisions are judged.

Congress felt broadcasting needed regulation, in part because the industry itself had requested it to reduce interference on the air, but also because there was (and is) insufficient spectrum to accommodate all who wish to broadcast. Further, the electromagnetic spectrum is held to be a natural public resource, and thus government oversees its use by licensing services needing spectrum.

In 1934, Congress passed the more comprehensive communications act, which brought telephone and broadcasting regulation under one agency, and which still governs federal regulatory policy, though it has been amended several times since. That law continues the "picon" standard, and established the FCC.

The federal communications commission, headquartered at 1919 m street nw, Washington dc, consists of five commissioners who are appointed by the president and approved by the U.S. Senate, and some 1,800 civil servants who provide the legal, engineering, and economic expertise required to regulate modern telecommunicatons. The FCC's annual budget is about $110 million, relatively small by federal government standards. The FCC's mass media bureau of some 300 people oversees broadcasting -- its chief function is to license stations.

Broadcast stations are licensed for seven years (radio) or five years (television) and these licenses May be and usually are renewed time and again. The licensing of services is the single most important function of the FCC. Cable systems, on the other hand, are franchised by local communities and there is little federal regulation of cable.

The FCC has the authority (delegated by Congress) to set technical standards for telecommunication services. Until the early 1980s, companies and industry groups would test competing systems for a given standard and would recommend a standard to the FCC which would usually then approve (mandate) that standard. The standards for black-and-white and color television (the NTSC system) and stereo fm were derived in this fashion.

With its decision on am stereo broadcasting in early 1982, the FCC moved away from that approach, leaving it to the defined "marketplace" to decide on a specific standard. The very limited success of am stereo suggests the marketplace approach does not work well here. The FCC is currently considering standards for high-definition television (HDTV) and will reach a decision early in 1993 on whether to select a given standard, or again follow the "let-the-marketplace-decide" approach.

There is very little regulation of programming in America. The primary reason for this is the first Amendment to the Constitution, discussed above. There are federal limits on

Use of obscene program materials, and there are requirements on access by candidates for political office.

Otherwise, the amount and type of programming provided by stations and cable systems are a matter of managerial choice, not government fiat. Most particularly, there is no government control over the broadcasting of news and public affairs programs.

Beginning in the late 1970s, the FCC began to undo some of its prior regulatory positions. Under the Reagan administration and FCC chairman mark Fowler in the 1980s, the FCC removed many long-standing rules or guidelines which had restricted broadcast stations.

This culminated with the August 1987 elimination of the "fairness doctrine" which had required stations to provide time for discussion of local controversial public issues, and to provide for varied points of view to be heard. The FCC reasoned that with so many stations -- with competing services -- that such a policy, which had been set up in 1949 when far fewer stations were on the air -- was needed.

By 1990, the pace of deregulation had slowed significantly, in part due to a feeling that the industry and government needed to assess what had already been done before going further. Recently, there have been FCC moves to regulate more firmly in some areas -- technical standards, obscene programming and the like. The FCC is getting along far better with Congress (from whence comes its annual budget, let alone Senate approval of presidential nominations of commissioners) which had grown concerned that deregulation was moving too far too fast.